

Application No. 09/876,137  
Attorney's Docket No. 77,119  
Page 8

#### REMARKS

Claims 19-27 are presented for consideration, claims 1-2, 9-10, and 12-13 have been amended, and claims 1-27 are pending in the application.

Initially, Examiner Alsomiri is thanked for the courtesies extended to the undersigned and to Cliff Temes during the personal interview of July 22, 2004.

During the interview, proposed amendments to Claims 1 and 12 were discussed. The claims have been amended along the lines discussed during the interview, and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

A few comments regarding some of the differences between the claims and the primary references cited in the Office Action (U.S. Patent No. 5,900,833 to Sunlin et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,867,117 to Gogineni et al.) are presented below.

Gogineni et al. is directed to a frequency-modulated radar, and in particular, a swept-step, frequency-modulated radar. Col. 3, lines 40-54. In contrast, Sunlin et al. discloses a radar transmitter that transmits impulse signals rather than a burst of RF energy. See, e.g., col. 3, lines 13-15, col. 3, lines 65 - col. 4, lines 13. Further, col. 1, lines 37-51 of Sunlin indicates that frequency modulated radar signals are unsatisfactory. At col. 4, lines 15-17, Sunlin states that the radar transmitter is of a type that supports an impulse signal rather than the type that supports a carrier-based system. It is respectfully submitted that Gogineni nor Sunlin would have provided any motivation to combine the devices in the manner suggested.

Application No. 09/876,137  
Attorney's Docket No. 77,119  
Page 9

To expedite prosecution, Claims 1, 2, and 12 have been amended to clarify that the radar transmission has a *carrier* frequency of at least 3 gigahertz, and Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the radar transmission is *pulsed*.

Sunlin et al. discloses an impulse radar transmission without any carrier signal at all. As discussed above, Sunlin et al. specifically states that its radar transmitter is not suitable for a carrier-based transmission. Gogenini et al. fails to disclose at least an aircraft and a plurality of radar receiving antennas. Accordingly, a combination of Sunlin et al. and Gogenini et al. would not result in a device or method having all the features of Claim 1. Similar distinctions apply to independent Claim 12.

It is noted that several of the dependent claims have been amended in minor ways intended to place them in better form for allowance, and not to further distinguish over any prior art.

For at least these reasons, Claims 1-18 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

#### New Claims

New claims 19-26 are presented to set forth additional subject matter to which the Applicants are believed to be entitled. These claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons claims 1-18 are allowable.

#### Conclusion

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee which may be due, or credit overpayments, to Deposit Account 50-0281.

Application No. 09/876,137  
Attorney's Docket No. 77,119  
Page 10

Should there be any questions regarding this submission, or regarding the application in general, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Sally A. Ferrett  
Registration No. 46,325

U.S. Naval Research Laboratory  
4555 Overlook Ave., SW, Code 1008.2  
Washington, DC 20375  
(202) 404-1551

July 22, 2004